

Minority Concentration District Project

Uttar Dinajpur, West Bengal

Sponsored by the Ministry of Minority Affairs

Government of India

Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta

R1, Baishnabghata Patuli Township

Kolkata 700 094, INDIA.

Tel.: (91) (33) 2462-7252, -5794, -5795

Fax: (91) (33) 24626183

E-mail: info@cssscal.org

Research Team

Faculty: Prof. Partha Chatterjee, Dr. Pranab Kumar Das, Dr. Sohel Firdos, Dr. Saibal Kar, Dr. Surajit C. Mukhopadhyay, Prof. Sugata Marjit.

Research Associate: Smt. Ruprekha Chowdhury.

Research Assistants: Smt. Anindita Chakraborty, Shri Biplab Das, Shri Somnath Das, Shri Avik Sankar Moitra, Shri Amritendu Roy and Shri Abhik Sarkar.

Acknowledgment

The research team at the CSSSC would like to thank Shri G. C. Manna, Deputy Director General, NSSO, Dr. Bandana Sen, Joint Director, NSSO, Shri Pawan Agarwal, Principal Secretary, MDW & ME, Shri A. Khaleque, Director & E.O. Joint Secretary, MDW, Shri A.A. Siddiqui, Joint Secretary MDW, Shri S.N. Pal, Director & E.O. Joint Secretary, Madrasah Education, Shri Arfan Ali Biswas, CEO, Board of Wakfs, Mr. Tanvir Afzal, General Manager, and Mr. Raktim Nag, Manager-Systems, West Bengal Minorities Development & Finance Corporation, Bhavani Bhavan, Kolkata and Shri Sukumar Bhattacharya, District Magistrate of Uttar Dinajpur and other department officials for their generous support and assistance in our work. We are also grateful to Father A. Pathumai and other staff of Social Welfare Institute, Raiganj for their generous help in organising and conducting the survey.

Content

An Overview.....	4
Significance of the Project.....	5
The Survey.....	7
Methodology.....	8
Introducing West Bengal.....	9
Uttar Dinajpur.....	10
Demography.....	10
Selected Villages in Respective Blocks.....	11
Map of the District of Uttar Dinajpur.....	12
Findings.....	13
1. Basic Amenities.....	13
2. Education.....	18
3. Occupation.....	28
4. Health.....	32
5. Infrastructure.....	37
6. Awareness about Government Schemes.....	37
7. Other issues.....	40
Recommendations.....	47

Appendices

Table A1: General information.....	50
Table A2: Transport and Communication.....	50
Fig. A 1 Sources of Water.....	51
Fig. A2: Distance to Post-Office.....	51
Fig. A3: Distance of Public Transport.....	52
Fig. A4: Average No. of Banks and.....	52
Other Financial Institutions	
Fig. A5: Irrigation.....	53
Sampling Methodology.....	54

The Minority Concentrated Districts Project

An Overview

The MCD project aims to provide a baseline survey on the state of minorities in the districts identified by the Ministry of Minority Affairs, Government of India. Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta, undertakes the project in the following districts: Uttar Dinajpur, Dakshin Dinajpur, Malda, Murshidabad, Birbhum, Nadia, South 24 Parganas, North 24 Parganas, Bardhaman, Koch Behar, Haora, Gajapati, North Sikkim and Nicobar Islands.¹

The objective of the proposed study has been conducting a baseline survey on religious minority population under the aegis of Indian Council of Social Science Research and funded by the Ministry of Minority Affairs. A total of ninety districts have been selected by the Ministry of Minority Affairs on the basis of three criteria, viz. minority population, religion specific socio economic indicators and basic amenities indicators. The Ministry has classified the districts with substantial minority population on the basis of religion specific socio economic indicators and basic amenities indicators respectively. The four religion specific socio-economic indicators are: (i) literacy rate, (ii) female literacy rate, (iii) work participation rate and (iv) female work participation rate. The four basic amenities are: (i) % of households with *pucca* walls, (ii) % of households with safe drinking water, (iii) % of households with electricity and (iv) % of households with W/C latrines. A total of 53 districts with both sets of indicators below national average were considered more backward and were classified into group 'A' and 37 districts with either of the indicator values below national average were classified into group 'B'. Group B was further classified into two sub-categories – B1 for which religion specific socio-economic indicators are below national average and B2 for which basic amenities indicators are below national average. The minorities are defined on the basis of National Commission of Minorities Act, 1992 and includes Muslims, Sikhs, Christians, Buddhists and Zoroastrians (Parsis).

Centre for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta would carry out the survey in 11 districts of West Bengal and one each in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Orissa and Sikkim. Of the 11 districts of West Bengal Uttar Dinajpur, Dakshin Dinajpur, Malda, Murshidabad, Birbhum,

¹ The spellings for the districts and state are in accordance with West Bengal Human Development Report, 2004

Nadia, South 24 Parganas, Brdhaman and Kochbihar are in group A while Haora, North 24 Parganas are in group B (sub-category B1). Nicobars in Andaman and Nicobar Island and North Sikkim in Sikkim are in group B (sub-category B2). Gajapati district in Orissa is in group A. It may also be noted that all the 11 districts of West Bengal are marked for Muslim minority category while Gajapati and Nicobars are marked for Christian minority category and North Sikkim for the Buddhist minority category.

The purpose of this survey is to help the district administration draw action plan for socio economic and infrastructure development of the selected districts for improving the quality of life of the people and reducing the imbalances during the 11 th. Five Year Plan. However, it may be noted that the benefits will accrue all sections of people in the district where intervention is executed (use a better term) and not only the minorities. To give a specific example, if a school is built up then all groups of people should have access to this school and not that only the Muslims in a district marked for a Muslim concentrated district.

Before elaborating on the MCD Project, it would be useful to highlight some of the main objectives of the Sachar Committee Report, upon which the latter is envisaged and formulated. The Sachar Committee Report (2006) on the social, economic and educational status of the Muslim community primarily dealt with the question of whether different socio-religious categories in India have had an equal chance to reap the benefits of development with a particular emphasis on Muslims in India. It proposes to identify the key areas of intervention by Government to address relevant issues relating to the socio-economic conditions of the Muslim community (SCR, 3).² Besides indicating the developmental deficits, the report illustrates how the perception among Muslims that they are discriminated against and excluded, is widespread (SCR, 237).

Significance of the MCD Project

The purpose of this survey is to help the district administration draw an action plan for socio economic and infrastructure development of the selected districts for improving the quality of life of the people and reducing the imbalances during the 11 th. Five Year Plan. However, it may be noted that the benefits will accrue all sections of people in the district where intervention is applied. To give a specific example, if a school is built up, then all groups of people would

² Sachar Committee will be written as 'SCR'.

have access to this school irrespective of socio-religious category. Based on the survey report, the MCD proposes to provide support, fiscal and otherwise, to all communities irrespective of religious affiliations.

From a sociological point of view the vision of the MCD project is to open up an in-depth understanding about not just the Muslim community but other minority communities as well, to ensure overall growth and development of the districts--that the term 'minority' is not restricted or limited to the Muslim community only, thus reinforcing the need for equity and inclusion as proposed in Sachar Report. In the Indian imagination, the term 'minority' is coeval with the Muslim community. The Sachar Report writes of how this particular community imagine themselves and is imagined by other socio-religious communities (SCR, 11) and observes how "the Muslims complained that they are constantly looked upon with a great degree of suspicion not only by certain sections of society but addresses the issues relating to Muslim minority community, the MCD makes for provisions to look into other socio-economic aspects common to all poor people and to minorities.

While the Sachar Committee Report agrees that the widespread perception of discrimination among the Muslim community needs to be addressed, nonetheless it admits that there are hardly any empirical studies that establish discrimination. (SCR, 239). The term, when associated particularly with the Muslim community, is fraught with negative meanings, imageries, and ideas that may trigger further speculation. It is highly nuanced with multi-layered causalities, and therefore any one to one correlation would make a simplistic argument. Needless to say, initiating a dialogue on the subject of discrimination and deprivation is not easy.³ Under the circumstance, the MCD project's baseline survey, in a way, acts as a tool⁴ to perpetuate wider social awareness, among the minority concentrated districts thereby constructively sustaining ongoing discussions and dialogues on this delicate issue. In doing so, it urges the larger society to think through issues of discrimination and the like such as casteism, groupism, etc—the social hurdles which seemingly appear to play little to no direct role in addressing and reducing

³ During the course of our survey, the discussions on 'discrimination' and 'deprivation' were carefully articulated to the respondent. People ranging from Government officials to the people of the community were careful not to use certain terminologies in the conversation.

⁴ It would be useful to look at how survey study itself can be a tool to generate social awareness. This argument calls for further elaboration that is beyond the scope of the present report.

developmental deficits, are nonetheless inextricably linked to the overall growth and advancement of the country.⁵

By focusing on the 14 districts, extended over 3 states and 1 union territory, viz. West Bengal, Orissa, Sikkim and Andaman and Nicobar Islands respectively, the MCD project headed by the Center for Studies in Social Sciences, Calcutta, aims to gain an in-depth and detailed view of the socio-economic conditions of the communities living in these districts and create socio-economic profiles of the districts by identifying the key developmental deficits viz. health, literacy rate, female work participation etc. that have a significant bearing on the overall growth and expansion of a State. The project is a district level plan that doesn't necessarily target the minority community, and therefore although it will identify the minority community, the funds will be allocated across communities irrespective of socio-religious affiliations. (See ICSSR's Expert Committee Meeting on Baseline Survey of Minority Concentration Districts, p.2)

The MCD also looks into issues pertaining to non-implementation of various schemes and programmes offered by the Government. The Sachar Committee quotes of how the 'non-implementation' of several earlier Commissions and Committee has made the Muslim community wary of any new initiative (SCR, 10).

The Survey

The MCD project undertakes a baseline survey to address the socio-economic issues of the district communities. A baseline survey is significant as it creates a rich database, which allows us to interrogate, and provides us with more research options. Also, it allows us to create a benchmark for future survey on the focused areas that need immediate Government intervention. The new data collected and collated by baseline survey will thus build on and supplement the existing data provided by Census and the Sachar Committee.

There is a need to describe developmental deficits in terms of figures and numbers, one has to take cognizance of how the 'social' is intertwined with the economic parameters of human conditions and vice versa. This approach towards research would allow us to gain a holistic perspective while at the same time enabling us to stay focused on certain key aspects of development of the minority concentrated districts.

⁵ The Sachar Committee Report notes that the widespread perception of discrimination among the Muslim community needs to be addressed but admits that 'there are hardly any empirical studies that establish discrimination.' (SCR pp.239)

Previous research such as the State HDR (West Bengal) did not treat the Muslim community as a separate socio-religious group. While data for SC/STs and on gaps in development exist, the absence of focus on the Muslim community does not bring to the fore their specific socio-economic status. While certain socio-economic conditions would be applicable across communities in terms of literacy, employment, or such like, a specific focus on minorities would also show the relative position vis-à-vis other disadvantaged groups namely the SC/STs. The advantage of focusing on the conditions of minorities in terms of standard socio-economic indices is to clearly highlight their condition, which would have been glossed over if the research were conducted by focusing on the SC/STs only.

Methodology

The survey has been conducted at two stages. The census villages are primary sampling units. Based on the proportion of minority population the development blocks and accordingly the villages are grouped into three strata where first stratum is top 20%, second one is middle 50% and the third is the bottom 30%. If district population is more than 0.5 Million then a total of 30 villages will be chosen which will be distributed in the three strata in proportion to population of the respective strata. The villages are chosen by the method of probability proportional to size given the number of villages to be chosen from each stratum. In the second stage a total of 30 households are chosen from each village randomly in proportion to religious group in the total population of the village. However our population is not the whole village but two hamlet groups if village population exceeds 1200. The hamlet group with highest concentration of minority population is chosen with probability one and another is chosen from the rest hamlet groups randomly. Typical size of a hamlet group is 600.

The methodology employs two types of survey instruments – one a rural household questionnaire and second, a village schedule. Household schedule would be used to identify socio-economic parameters, as well as, to understand both the individual and the collective experiences of people living in these areas. The village schedule would be instrumental in collecting the village average data. This data will be collected from the various government offices, such as the office of the District Magistrate, the Block Development Officer, the

Agricultural Department; the office of the Panchayat Pradhan, ICDS centres etc. It will be useful in understanding the nature of the village in terms of availability of infrastructure, access to basic amenities such as health services, education, land and irrigation and the like.

Besides very few descriptive open-ended questions, the questionnaires primarily consist of short, close-ended questions, with appropriate coding categories. An instruction sheet with comments, wherever necessary, is annexed for further clarification of the questionnaire if and when so required. Pre-testing of the questionnaire was accomplished through various drafts, where members of the faculty and team met and discussed on a weekly basis, to evaluate the comprehensibility, conviviality, (whether the questions are relevant) and competency (whether the respondents will be able to answer reliably) of the questions being asked.

The methodology has required appointing and training supervisors and field investigators in the districts for conducting the survey among the rural householders effectively. The interviews have been carried out with the consent and voluntary participation of the respondents. Confidentiality and their right to privacy have been safeguarded at all times.

Introducing West Bengal

West Bengal is the fourth most populous state in the Eastern Region of India accounting for 2.7 % of India's total area, 7.8 % of the country's population and ranks first in terms of density of population which is 904 per square Km. Muslims are the dominant minority and account for 27 % of the total population of the State. With 72% of people living in rural areas, the State of West Bengal is primarily an agrarian state with the main produce being rice and jute. About 31.8% of the total population lives below the poverty line.

Previous research on West Bengal has shown that certain districts such as Darjeeling, Jalpaiguri, Koch Behar, Malda, Uttar Dinajpur and Dakshin Dinajpur in the north, Purulia, Bankura, Birbhum in the west and the two 24 Parganas (north and south) stretching across the Sunderbans are relatively more backward socio-economically than the rest of the districts in West Bengal. It is equally worth noting that the concentration of Muslim minority in the state of West Bengal is higher than the national average. (SCR, 30)

Uttar Dinajpur

The district of Uttar Dinajpur as Muslim minority district belongs to category 'A' of the MCD districts with 47.36% Muslim population and religion specific average socio-economic indicator value 29.7 and average basic indicator value 9.2.⁶

Raiganj, district headquarter, is far off from Kolkata, the state capital and is not well connected by road and railways. In fact until very recently there was no rail services, it is only since 30.12.2004 that district has got connected through railways via Malda. It is via roadways that the district is connected with the rest of West Bengal or other parts of the country. There are 9 CD Blocks, 98 *Gram Panchayats* in the district. The district has 1438 primary schools, 113 secondary and higher secondary schools, 3 degree colleges and 1517 ICDS centres.

Demography

Of the 18 districts of West Bengal, Uttar Dinajpur ranks 13 th. in terms of Human Development Index (Human Development Report, 2004, p. 219). The density of population is 778 per square Km. The total population of the district is 2441794 (Census, 2001) with a decadal rate of growth of 28.72% over 1991 census. Of the total population the rural population is approximately 87.94%. The SC and ST population of the district are 27.71% and 5.11% respectively. The literacy rate is 47.89% and the female literacy rate is 36.51. The rate of work participation is 38.31% and the female work participation rate is 23.84%. Agriculture is the most dominant occupation of the district population.

⁶ The corresponding national averages are 45.8% and 41.7% respectively as calculated by the Ministry of Minority Affairs.

Selected Villages in Respective Blocks

Block	Village code	Village Name	No. of Hhs	Population
Goalpokhar - I	00289200	Churakuti	772	4597
	00289300	Khrhila	101	541
	00289700	Panjipara	1807	9515
	00290300	Hanskunda	920	4971
	00301700	Bangaon	536	2758
Islampur	00279100	Masid Kismat	244	1351
	00287100	Birnakundi	886	4654
Chopra	00268800	Bhagabati	1701	8868
	00269000	Chopra	892	4544
	00269800	Balarampur	613	3085
	00274700	Lakhipur @	1578	8981
	00277900	Bara Damaodarpur	528	2816
Goalpokhar - II	00318900	Chikni Barhas	162	920
Karandighi	00324700	Soshilapur	133	739
	00331800	Bajargaon	643	3700
	00336000	Bikaur	544	2921
	00336200	Pandepur @	447	2434
Itahar	00395700	Damdalia	564	2578
	00402900	Bishnupur	23	105
Raiganj	00343800	Narayantola	82	405
	00353800	Basudebpur	197	1064
	00357400	Bogram	721	3211
	00357600	Mahendigaon	462	2186
	00361400	Bamangram	456	2293
	00363800	Rishipur	231	1145
	00364500	Pardha	294	1325
Kaliaganj	00380400	Nehalipara	146	632
	00386600	Kuanrpur	235	1155

Note: @ means the village repeated once.

Findings

In line with the aims and objectives of the Ministry of Minority Affairs, CSSSC has identified the following key areas in the District of Uttar Dinajpur. We have systematically provided the district level averages followed by the village level findings on a variety of aspects including the broad categories of **Basic Amenities; Education; Health; Infrastructure; Occupational conditions; Existence and Efficacy of Government Schemes and Any Other Issue** that is crucial for a better understanding of the conditions of the minorities as well as general population in the district. We provide two sets of tables – one for the data across villages to capture the locational variation preceded by the district averages computed for all the households surveyed in all the sample villages chosen in the district.

1. Basic Amenities

We begin with a distribution of the Basic Amenities in the district of Uttar Dinajpur calculated at the level of villages using the household survey data and it includes the types and percentage of houses under *Kutchal/ Pucca* constructions, percentage of electrified houses, the average distance of each house within a specific village from its source of drinking water, the percentage of houses in these villages with access to toilet facilities, and the type of fuel used. It shows that the 21.62% Muslim households on average have in-house toilet facilities compared to 37.38% for non-Muslim households. This is undoubtedly a glaring disparity that needs to be acted upon. There is also a wide variation across villages. The percentage of in-house toilet facility in Chikni Barhas, Khrhila in Goalpokhar I Block, Soshilapor in Karandighi Block is found to be as low as 0% and in majority of the villages lower than 80%. On the higher side villages, such as Mahendigaon (96.55%) in Raiganj Block, Nehalipara (96.67%) in Kaliaganj Block which are relatively more close to the district Head Quarter or sub-divisional town and shows the urban bias in respect of basic amenities. Those who have toilet facility inside their premises have not hygienic provision in general with very small percentage of any kind of W/C type. In this connection it may be noted that in our discussion with government officials and Panchayat functionaries this has been emphasized that often it is the case that though a large fund is available for low cost toilet, but people are reluctant to access such benefits even though their

Table 1: Basic Amenities of Household – District Averages (%)

Amenities		Muslim	Non Muslim
Percentage of houses electrified		22.10	26.67
Primary source of light if house is not electrified (%)	Oil Lamp	99.15	99.67
	Oil Lantern	0.85	0.33
	Petromax	0.00	0.00
	Others	0.00	0.00
Source of Water (%)	Own Hand Pump/ Tube Well	58.53	73.92
	Public Hand Pump/ Tube Well	22.89	22.73
	Tap water	0.65	0.24
	Public Un-protected dug Well	0.65	0.00
	Public Protected dug Well	3.46	0.96
	Pond/River/Stream	0.86	0.24
	Others	12.96	1.91
Average Distance from source of Water(K.M)		0.41	0.45
Position of Toilet (%)	In House	21.62	37.38
	Outside House	78.38	62.62
Type of Toilet (%)	Septic Tank Latrine	25.26	21.05
	Water Sealed Latrine in House	3.16	5.92
	Pit Latrine	3.16	3.29
	Covered Dry Latrine	3.16	5.92
	Well Water Sealed	9.47	24.34
	Others	55.79	39.47
Primary Source of Fuel (%)	Wood	28.48	28.98
	Coal	0.00	0.48
	Kerosene Oil	3.31	2.61
	Leaves/ Hay	60.04	63.66
	LPG	0.88	1.19
	Others	7.28	3.09
Drainage Facility (%)	% with drainage facility in house	18.98	10.00

Source: Household survey data.

Table 2: Village wise Basic Amenities of Households (in percentage)

Name of the Village	Type of Houses			Avg. distance for source of drinking water (Km.)	Electrified houses	Households having Septic Tank /water/Sealed/Well-water Latrine	Type of Fuel used						Toilet outside house
	Kutcha	Kutcha-Pucca	Pucca				Wood	Coal	Kerosene Oil	Leaves/Hay	LPG	Others	
CHIKNI BARHAS	82.76	13.79	3.45	1.02	10.00	N.A.	6.67	0.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	3.33	100.0
BHAGABATI	96.43	0.00	3.57	0.02	13.33	60.00	96.67	3.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	83.33
CHOPRA	72.41	6.90	20.69	0.75	70.00	64.29	35.71	0.00	0.00	50.00	14.3	0.00	53.33
BALARAMPUR	89.66	6.90	3.45	1.34	28.57	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.00
LAKHIPUR	89.66	6.90	3.45	0.34	34.48	100.00	51.85	0.00	0.00	48.15	0.00	0.00	76.67
BARA DAMAODARPUR	93.33	6.67	0.00	0.48	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	93.10
MASID KISMAT	96.67	3.33	0.00	0.18	6.90	0.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	96.67	0.00	0.00	93.33
BIRNAKUNDI	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.51	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	13.33	86.67	0.00	0.00	100.0
CHURAKUTI	76.67	20.00	3.33	0.51	36.67	22.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	96.67	0.00	3.33	40.00
KHRHILA	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.10	27.59	N.A.	0.00	0.00	10.34	89.66	0.00	0.00	100.0
PANJIPARA	81.48	3.70	14.81	0.35	60.00	62.50	77.27	0.00	0.00	13.64	9.09	0.00	71.43
HANSKUNDA	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.35	10.34	50.00	66.67	0.00	3.33	30.00	0.00	0.00	93.10
BANGAON	93.10	3.45	3.45	0.06	36.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.67	0.00	93.3	70.00
SOSHILAPUR	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.33	N.A.	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100.0
BAJARGAON	50.00	30.00	20.00	0.56	50.00	100.00	60.00	3.33	10.00	26.67	0.00	0.00	86.67
BIKAUR	50.00	23.33	26.67	0.15	44.83	88.89	6.67	0.00	3.33	80.00	0.00	10.0	40.00
PANDEPUR	86.67	6.67	6.67	0.00	30.00	50.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	90.00	3.33	0.00	86.67
BASUDEBPUR	86.67	10.00	3.33	1.00	13.79	40.00	3.33	0.00	0.00	96.67	0.00	0.00	83.33
NARAYANTOLA	76.67	23.33	0.00	0.42	0.00	11.76	3.33	0.00	13.33	83.33	0.00	0.00	43.33
BOGRAM	56.67	33.33	10.00	0.00	56.67	75.00	30.00	0.00	6.67	53.33	3.33	6.67	20.00
MAHENDIGAON	70.00	30.00	0.00	1.50	50.00	53.57	6.67	0.00	0.00	90.00	0.00	3.33	3.45
BAMANGRAM	90.00	6.67	3.33	0.00	6.67	8.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	93.33	0.00	0.00	10.71
RISHIPUR	89.66	10.34	0.00	0.00	0.00	N.A.	20.00	0.00	0.00	73.33	0.00	6.67	96.43
NEHALIPARA	90.00	10.00	0.00	0.23	24.14	3.45	0.00	0.00	20.00	73.33	0.00	6.67	3.33
PARDHA	92.86	7.14	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	3.45	0.00	0.00	96.55	0.00	0.00	89.66
KUANRPUR	83.33	13.33	3.33	0.00	43.33	100.00	53.33	0.00	6.67	40.00	0.00	0.00	66.67
DAMDALIA	73.08	11.54	11.54	0.19	3.33	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	80.00	0.00	20.0	93.10
BISHNUPUR	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.88	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	95.65

Source: Village survey data.

Note: N.A means *not available*

contribution is only 10%. So the problem cannot be solved by allocating more funds only, but other measures, such as awareness and campaigning at the level of households is urgently called for. Compared to this, the level of average electrification in the Muslim households is marginally lower at 22.1% compared to 26.67% for non-Muslim households. Once again at the village level, Bara Damodarpur, Birnakundi, Soshilapor, Narayantola, Pardha, Damdalia and Bishnupur report zero or very low percentage. However, in the case of electrification often Blocks close to district Head Quarter or sub-divisional town do not necessarily show better performance. For cooking fuel and other households activities, most households are dependent on wood and stray sources, such as gathered leaves and hay and barring a few villages as Chopra, Panjipara, Pandepur and Bogram no village in our sample has access to LPG. Kerosene is also sparingly used. Majority of Muslim or non-Muslim households have access to private hand pumps or tube wells or public tube wells or hand pumps though Muslim families are worse off (around 70%) compared to non-Muslims (over 90%). Usage of tap water is slightly higher for Muslims (0.65%) than non-Muslims (0.24%). In general the district is well placed in respect of safe drinking water. The average distance traversed for procurement of water is not much and in fact well within half Km. for both Muslims and non-Muslims. All these information is directly available from Tables 1 and 2 and may be used for specific actions.

There is however, scope for immense intervention in the types of houses the respondent and therefore the average person in each village surveyed lives in. There is no village in our sample which has more than 50% households with *pucca* and *kutcha-pucca* houses taken together. Proportion of *pucca* or even *kutcha-pucca* houses are more prevalent in the relatively developed or in the areas that are close to district head quarter or sub-divisional town. Not surprisingly therefore, majority of the villages have *kutcha* houses and although 98.5% of Muslim and 99.29% of non-Muslim households own their houses, only 0% of the Muslim families surveyed and 0.24% of the latter received it under the IAY (see Table 3). Housing condition appears by and large similar for the Muslim households as compared to non-Muslims, as on average 85.46 % of Muslim compared to 82.73% of non-Muslim houses live in *kutcha* houses, 9.69% of Muslims and 11.75% of non-Muslims live in *kutcha-pucca* houses. Of the *pucca* houses across villages in Uttar Dinajpur, 4.85% belong to Muslims and 5.28% belong to

non-Muslims.⁷ *This we believe should be an area where top up facilities may be extended. It is understood that construction and maintenance of better houses require large investments from the residents, which if channeled into provision of education and health facilities among the children and women shall serve a better purpose under all possible conditions.*

Table 3: Housing- Ownership, Type and Value - District Averages

Religion group		Muslim	Non Muslim
Ownership of House (%)	Own	98.50	99.29
	IAY/ Government Provided	0.00	0.24
	Rented	1.50	0.48
Type of House (%)	Kutchha	85.46	82.73
	Kutchha-Pucca	9.69	11.75
	Pucca	4.85	5.28
	Others	0.00	0.24
Land adjoining own residence (%)	Own	47.01	31.20
	Provided By Government	2.44	0.98
	Land Holders Land	47.23	58.97
	Others	3.33	8.85
Average Value of Own House (Rs.)		49431.95	70251.11
Average Rent (Rs.) per month		878.33	750.00

Source: Household survey data

In respect of other amenities and assets, such as for telephones or mobiles it may be noted that there is not differences across communities. Of the Muslim families 1.28% and 14.04% have telephones and mobile phones respectively while the corresponding figures for non-Muslims are 1.65% and 17.73%. Percentage of Muslim families owning two wheelers is 3.4% and 3.55% for non-Muslims.

⁷ This is percentage with respect to the general population. The same as the percentage of BPL families for the district as a whole is 2.95%.

Table 4: Other Amenities of Household - District Averages

Religion group		Muslim	Non Muslim
Percentage of people with	Telephone	1.28	1.65
	Mobile	14.04	17.73
Average Price (Rs.)	Telephone	1616.67	1414.29
	Mobile	1840.14	2086.67

Source: Household survey data

Note: N.A means not available.

Table 5: Non-agricultural Assets – District Averages

		Muslim	Non Muslim
Oxcart	Percentage of household who own	2.55	0.95
	Average Price(Rs)	6000.0	4000.0
Motor cycle/ Scooter/ Mopeds	Percentage of households who own	3.40	3.55
	Average Price (Rs)	25993.75	35536.67

Source: Household survey data

Note: NA means not available.

2. Education

The household survey on educational conditions offer a plethora of data on both Muslim and non-Muslim households (Table 6). Of the many glaring facts, one should begin with the level of illiteracy among Muslim households that stands at 48.63% for the male and 56.84% for the female. Of the rest who are deemed literate, the percentage of below primary educated male is 21.72 and female 20.77 and the percentage steadily dwindles as one goes higher up till the secondary level (Male 3.43% and Female 1.95%). The situation is not appreciably better for non-Muslim households, where literacy level is almost similar, and secondary school going

percentage for male is 6.25 and female, 2.61. It seems almost self-selection among those who could continue to the highest possible level of graduation – those who stayed onto the higher secondary level also continued till graduation and at that point the disparity across Muslim and non-Muslim households almost vanishes as does the gender gap across religions.

Table 9 clearly identifies the reasons why the dropout rates have been so high for most school goers. On average more than 50% of all dropouts across villages and across communities in the district report that the cost of remaining in school is quite high – both the direct cost and the indirect cost of not earning anything while in school. Despite the fact that distance wise, most Muslim (66.94%) and non Muslims (58.32%) households find the school almost in the neighbourhood within a distance of 1 Km, continuation becomes infeasible at a very early stage due to the high opportunity cost (next best alternative to school is go out for work and earn for the family) of being in school. It is worth mention that the incidence of dropout occurs between primary and eighth standard. The latter is the age when children is old enough for working as (child) labour supplemented by the fact that at scope of alternative education that can ensure better job opportunity is altogether absent. This also, is a potential point of intervention where without stressing on the supply of schools, the emphasis should be on provisions of supplementary resources that could keep them in school. We do not think mid-day meal alone can address this problem successfully, because the respondents clearly voiced their positions on the choice between school and work and the only way they could continue in school is providing the household sending children to school with a subsidy equivalent to the income they would lose by not working during that time. Conversely, if the families that send children to school receive higher income from their existing jobs that may relax the constraint facing these children intending to attend school on a longer term. *We therefore, re-emphasize that this is an area although well known to both academic and policy-making communities need larger attention. What we propose is that the households that choose to send children to school may be provided with additional income support during the school years so that the student does not drop out and transform into child labour. In fact, provisions of such facilities in kind are already in practice, and include the mid-day meal arrangements although with several problems of mismanagement and corruption among the organizers that the scheme regularly suffers from.* Still it does not take care of the opportunity cost in full, since it is well known that putting children in the work force is essentially a decision taken by one or both parents under the condition that children's

leisure is a luxury good under dire necessity of survival for the household. *Thus, we would like to draw attention to policies that can ensure such in-school support program for the household instead of creating larger supply of such facilities. This will obviously require targeting of households which have shown positive choice towards sending children to school and those who would also be forthright in withdrawing the same in case of drop in household income levels below a critical level.* It is also important to identify if these are also the households, which are more vulnerable than others in terms of health facilities, or parental access to regular work and other demographic features different from those which choose to retain their children in school. Tables 7-12 categorically identify these features that hinder school attendance among the village children. It is both generic across villages surveyed in Nadia and strongly buttress the argument in favour of subsidiary arrangements to boost school attendance among this mass.

Table 6: Level of Education of General Population – District Average (%)

Descriptive	Muslim		Non Muslim	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Illiterate	48.63	56.84	44.10	58.39
Below Primary	21.72	20.77	20.90	17.99
Primary	14.29	12.79	15.76	12.06
Middle	8.61	5.62	9.26	7.54
Vocational/management	0.00	0.00	0.24	0.10
Secondary	3.43	1.95	6.25	2.61
Higher Secondary	1.19	0.90	1.82	0.80
Technical Diploma	0.00	0.08	0.16	0.00
Technical/Professional Degree	0.12	0.00	0.08	0.00
Graduate	1.00	0.00	0.95	0.20
Post Graduate	0.12	0.00	0.48	0.10
Others	0.87	1.06	0.00	0.20

Source: Household survey data.

Table 7: State of Education for 5 to 18 age group – District Averages (%)

		Muslim	Non Muslim
Condition	Not admitted to school	13.12	10.58
Level	Below primary education	45.60	46.71
	Primary education	30.09	30.86
	Class Eight	12.75	9.88
	Vocational	0.00	0.21
	Secondary	4.07	5.14
	Higher Secondary	1.84	1.03
Type of school	Government/ Aided School	81.30	85.41
	Private School	3.98	11.84
	Madrasah	10.74	0.00
	Missionary School	0.66	1.69
	Unconventional school	3.32	1.06
	Others	0.00	0.00

Source: Household survey data.

Table 8: Village wise State of Education – General Population (%)

Name of Village	Literacy Rate	
	Male	Female
CHIKNI BARHAS	36.08	30.00
BHAGABATI	62.92	50.65
CHOPRA	69.39	61.97
BALARAMPUR	53.61	37.50
LAKHIPUR	66.99	52.70
BARA DAMAODARPUR	34.26	24.69
MASID KISMAT	43.90	33.75
BIRNAKUNDI	73.68	63.29
CHURAKUTI	39.02	36.26
KHRHILA	30.21	22.97
PANJIPARA	43.59	32.47
HANSKUNDA	63.48	50.00
BANGAON	21.98	22.73
SOSHILAPUR	29.41	24.14
BAJARGAON	67.71	56.36
BIKAUR	69.16	57.95
PANDEPUR	63.27	41.38
BASUDEBPUR	50.52	36.76
NARAYANTOLA	70.51	64.41
BOGRAM	76.40	61.97
MAHENDIGAON	45.59	32.35
BAMANGRAM	50.00	52.86
RISHIPUR	56.67	53.85
NEHALIPARA	25.00	15.94
PARDHA	60.61	30.43
KUANRPUR	73.63	60.53
DAMDALIA	52.43	45.59
BISHNUPUR	37.21	19.64
CHIKNI BARHAS	36.08	30.00

Source: Household survey data.

**Table 9: Education – Infrastructure facilities
(District Averages in %)**

Distance	Community	Muslim		Non Muslim	
	Below 1 K.M.	66.94		58.32	
	1-2 K.M.	16.12		22.03	
	2-4 K.M.	12.30		14.47	
	Above 4 K.M.	4.64		5.18	
Instruction	Bengali	64.94		58.69	
	English	1.86		1.69	
	Bengali & English	11.95		39.41	
	Hindi	0.40		0.21	
	Local Language	0.27		0.00	
Govern- ment Help	Books	73.82		66.85	
	School dress	7.64		4.14	
	Stipend	0.18		14.09	
	Mid-day meal	17.82		12.43	
	Others	0.55		2.49	
Reasons for drop-out		Male	Female	Male	Female
	Distance	20.0	9.52	45.31	38.18
	Not proper teaching	26.19	17.07	55.38	45.45
	Unavailability of water, classroom and toilet	17.07	5.0	42.86	32.72
	Unable to attend because of work	64.91	46.15	60.29	58.62
	It is expensive	58.49	51.02	64.71	69.84

Source: Household survey data.

Table 10: Education - Infrastructure and Aspirations (%)
(Community wise District Averages)

		Muslim		Non Muslim	
Mid-day meal	Regularity	92.75		95.08	
	Taste	60.19		64.71	
	Cleanliness	57.41		53.48	
Book	Availability	54.72		63.59	
Teachers	Regularity	91.89		93.28	
	Discipline	91.75		88.14	
	Teaching	75.68		68.38	
Aspiration of parents		Male	Female	Male	Female
	Vocational	4.84	1.71	6.30	4.57
	Madhyamik	53.98	70.89	38.19	64.38
	H.S	12.80	9.93	18.50	12.33
	Graduate	14.88	10.62	21.26	11.87
	Post-Graduate	7.27	3.42	6.30	4.11
	Professional Courses	4.84	2.40	9.06	1.83
	Others	1.38	1.03	0.39	0.91

Source: Household survey data.

Table 11: Rate of Dropout from School – Community and Gender wise(%)
(District Averages)

Level of dropout	Muslim		Non Muslim	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
< Primary	32.0	59.26	28.13	43.75
<Class Eight	64.0	81.48	53.13	68.75

Source: Household Survey Data

Table 12: Reason For Drop Out – Village wise (%)

Name of the Village	Male					Female				
	Distance	Absence of any teaching in	No Drinking water	Labour	Expenditure	Distance	Absence of any teaching in school	No Drinking water	Labour	Expenditure
CHIKNI BARHAS	100.0	N.A.	N.A.	83.33	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	50.00	N.A.
BHAGABATI	0.00	N.A.	0.00	66.67	50.00	0.00	N.A.	0.00	44.44	88.89
CHOPRA	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BALARAMPUR	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
LAKHIPUR	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	0.00
BARA DAMAODARPUR	0.00	N.A.	0.00	90.00	100.0	0.00	N.A.	0.00	83.33	100.0
MASID KISMAT	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	80.00	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	80.00
BIRNAKUNDI	0.00	N.A.	0.00	N.A.	100.0	50.00	N.A.	50.00	100.0	100.0
CHURAKUTI	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	0.00
KHRHILA	0.00	N.A.	0.00	83.33	83.33	33.33	N.A.	0.00	83.33	85.71
PANJIPARA	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
HANSKUNDA	100.0	N.A.	50.00	100.0	100.0	100.0	N.A.	N.A.	100.0	100.0
BANGAON	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	0.00
SOSHILAPUR	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	N.A.	0.00	16.67	100.0
BAJARGAON	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	100.0	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	50.00
BIKAUR	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	75.00	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	50.00
PANDEPUR	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	N.A.	0.00	25.00	100.0
BASUDEBPUR	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
NARAYANTOLA	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	100.0
BOGRAM	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	100.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
MAHENDIGAON	0.00	N.A.	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	100.0
BAMANGRAM	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	100.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
RISHIPUR	75.00	N.A.	75.00	75.00	100.0	33.33	N.A.	33.33	100.0	100.0
NEHALIPARA	54.55	N.A.	56.52	65.22	34.78	54.55	N.A.	36.36	36.36	18.18
PARDHA	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	50.00	0.00	N.A.	0.00	100.0	85.71
KUANRPUR	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	100.0	100.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	100.0	100.0
DAMDALIA	66.67	N.A.	50.00	100.0	50.00	50.00	N.A.	50.00	100.0	50.00
BISHNUPUR	84.21	N.A.	78.95	78.95	68.42	82.35	N.A.	76.47	76.47	64.71

Source: Village survey data.

Note: N.A means *not available*.

**Table 13: Vocational Education (%)
(Community wise District Averages)**

Courses		Muslim	Non Muslim
	Tailoring	21.31	14.06
	Computer Trained	1.64	6.25
	Electronic & Electrical	3.28	4.69
	Driving Training	13.11	21.88
	Handicraft	11.48	15.63
	Apprentices	0.00	1.56
	Family Education	6.56	12.50
	Other	42.62	23.44
Institution	Government Institution.	1.64	4.69
	Expert Worker	36.07	43.75
	Apprentices Training	3.28	17.19
Diploma Certificate	Number of people who hold	8.00	20.00
	Whether useful	75.00	66.67
Average. Duration of training (in days)		13.41	18.02
Average Expenditure for training (Rs.)		2997.22	8340.04

Source: Household survey data.

Table 14: Demand for Technical/ Vocational Education (%)

Religion		Muslim	Non Muslim
People Interested in Training		31.45	42.45
Type of Training	Tailoring	16.55	17.51
	Sericulture	0.72	2.82
	Automobile Labour	8.63	7.91
	Computer	19.42	20.90
	Electronics & Electrical	2.16	16.95
	Motor Driving Training	11.51	7.91
	Handicraft	24.46	21.47
	Apprentice	6.47	0.56
	Family Education	2.88	3.95
	Others	7.19	0.00
Cost (Rs.)	Willing to bear the cost	57.14	66.10

Source: Household survey data.

Table 15: Village wise Demand for Technical/Vocational Education (in %)

Name of the Village	People interested in training	People willing to bear the cost	Tailoring	Sericulture	Automobile Labour	Computer Training	Electronics & Electrical	Motor Driving	Handicraft	Apprentice	Family Education	Others
CHIKNI BARHAS	66.67	66.67	9.52	0.00	19.05	19.05	0.00	38.10	0	14.29	0	0.00
BHAGABATI	87.50	87.50	25.00	0.00	12.50	37.50	0.00	12.50	12.5	0	0	0.00
CHOPRA	71.43	71.43	0.00	0.00	0.00	71.43	0.00	0.00	28.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
BALARAMPUR	100.00	100.0	75.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
LAKHIPUR	50.00	50.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	50.00
BARA DAMAODARPUR	NaN	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
MASID KISMAT	62.50	62.50	62.50	0.00	12.50	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BIRNAKUNDI	3.33	3.33	3.33	3.33	10.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	76.67	0.00	0.00	0.00
CHURAKUTI	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	0.00
KHRHILA	100.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PANJIPARA	60.00	60.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.00
HANSKUNDA	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BANGAON	66.67	66.67	16.67	0.00	33.33	33.33	16.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
SOSHILAPUR	88.24	88.24	29.41	0.00	5.88	5.88	0.00	5.88	52.94	0.00	0.00	0.00
BAJARGAON	94.12	94.12	0.00	5.88	17.65	17.65	11.76	5.88	41.18	0.00	0.00	0.00
BIKAUR	100.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	88.89	11.11	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PANDEPUR	71.43	71.43	28.57	7.14	21.43	0.00	7.14	7.14	28.57	0.00	0.00	0.00
BASUDEBPUR	85.71	85.71	14.29	0.00	0.00	42.86	42.86	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NARAYANTOLA	37.04	37.04	25.93	0.00	0.00	7.41	0.00	7.41	14.81	11.11	22.22	11.11
BOGRAM	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MAHENDIGAON	81.25	81.25	56.25	0.00	6.25	31.25	0.00	0.00	6.25	0.00	0.00	0.00
BAMANGRAM	100.00	100.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33	0.00	8.33	25.00	16.67	33.33	8.33
RISHIPUR	53.85	53.85	30.77	0.00	0.00	23.08	15.38	23.08	7.69	0.00	0.00	0.00
NEHALIPARA	14.81	14.81	0.00	0.00	3.70	25.93	62.96	7.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PARDHA	100.00	100.0	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
KUANRPUR	100.00	100.0	0.00	7.14	3.57	14.29	14.29	21.43	39.29	0.00	0.00	0.00
DAMDALIA	85.71	85.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	14.29
BISHNUPUR	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00	0.00

Source: Village survey data

Note: N.A means *not available*

The demand for technical and vocational training also reflects the significant gap that exists between agricultural and non-agricultural work participation in the villages surveyed. The predominance of casual workforce in agriculture and allied occupations among the working population clearly displays the lack of skill in both religious groups. Given the findings on

educational choices and preferences it is undoubtedly related that the population strongly prefers the supply of such training facilities to replace or add on to the general educational trainings. In fact, the overwhelming demand for training in handicrafts and computer epitomizes the awareness, even if incomplete, of the beckoning possibilities as perceived by the respondents surveyed. While a higher literacy rate is a definite precursor for even partial awareness in this regard, the need for technical education is a certain emphasis among the potential workforce that should not be downplayed under any circumstances. The public funds must be allocated towards provision of such facilities in the areas covered in this study.

3. Occupation

It is readily revealed by the tables below (Tables 16 through 19) that agriculture is the major source of livelihood for both the communities, either as cultivator or as landless agricultural labourers. Interestingly like many other districts of West Bengal, Muslim participation in government jobs is lower compared to other communities in this district, though the percentage of such employees is quite small. More impoverished villages are also the ones with largest participation in casual agricultural work. However, across communities there is very little female participation in work although there is a sizable share in both Muslim and non-Muslim communities who do not classify as either in full time or casual jobs or purely engaged in household maintenance. Given the fact that major source of occupation is agriculture it only reflects disguised unemployment in agriculture leading to effectively low productivity. The share of long term migrant workers is quite sizable (Table 17) and major proportion from both Muslims and non-Muslims go to towns of other states for work. Across religious groups there is homogeneity in the type of occupation the migrant workers get involved in – mostly as transport workers and labourers. A large part from both groups also goes outside villages as professional worker. These systematically indicate the lack of opportunities in the province and that even traditional migrant pullers like the city of Kolkata has become less attractive to job seekers from the villages.

Table 16: Work participation – Community wise District Averages (%)

	Muslim		Non Muslim	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Agriculture	21.00	6.33	22.92	7.11
Agricultural Labour	19.95	4.65	22.60	10.71
Family Business	0.80	0.24	2.16	0.30
Salaried Employee (Govt.)	0.56	0.48	2.64	0.40
Salaried Employee (Private)	1.36	0.24	1.84	0.40
Casual Labour	14.45	3.21	5.75	1.10
Domestic and related work	1.05	36.30	1.76	42.14
Retirees, Pensioners, Remittance Recipient	0.25	0.00	0.32	0.50
Unable to work (Child/ Elderly)	10.56	14.10	9.90	14.31
Unorganised Employee	0.86	0.32	7.43	0.70
Student	22.36	28.45	17.17	20.32
Others	1.85	0.08	2.32	0.30
Unemployed	4.94	5.61	3.19	1.70

Source: Household survey data

Table 17: Migration for Work – Community wise District Averages (%)

Duration		Muslim	Non Muslim
	Short Term		40.74
Long Term		59.26	48.61
Place of work	Within District (Village)	1.85	8.33
	Within District (Town)	4.63	8.33
	Within State (Village)	0.00	8.33
	Within State (Town)	8.33	15.28
	Outside State (Village)	4.63	25.00
	Outside State (Town)	79.63	33.33
	Abroad	0.93	1.39
Reasons for migration	Professional Work	21.30	22.54
	Administrative Work	0.00	7.04
	Clerical Work	0.93	1.41
	Sales Work	6.48	1.41
	Farmer	4.63	0.00
	Transport and labourers	53.70	60.56
	Student	2.78	0.00
	Others	10.19	7.04
Repatriation	Household	83.02	88.89

Source: Household survey data

Table 18: Village wise Occupational pattern among the Male (in percentage)

Name of the Village	Male					
	Cultivator	Agricultural Labour	Business	Salaried Employee (Govt.)	Salaried Employee (Pvt.)	Casual Labour (Non-Agriculture)
CHIKNI BARHAS	15.46	19.59	1.03	0.00	1.03	19.59
BHAGABATI	6.74	28.09	1.12	3.37	2.25	12.36
CHOPRA	5.56	5.56	16.67	3.70	0.93	18.52
BALARAMPUR	18.75	27.08	0.00	2.08	0.00	0.00
LAKHIPUR	12.62	13.59	0.00	0.97	1.94	12.62
BARA DAMAODARPUR	18.52	19.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	28.70
MASID KISMAT	30.49	7.32	1.22	0.00	0.00	21.95
BIRNAKUNDI	31.93	15.97	0.84	0.00	0.84	14.29
CHURAKUTI	4.07	15.45	0.00	3.25	0.00	31.71
KHRHILA	12.50	37.50	0.00	0.00	1.04	12.50
PANJIPARA	5.98	35.90	3.42	0.00	3.42	3.42
HANSKUNDA	0.00	34.78	0.00	0.00	6.09	21.74
BANGAON	59.18	14.29	0.00	2.04	2.04	0.00
SOSHILAPUR	12.94	44.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BAJARGAON	42.71	16.67	0.00	0.00	2.08	1.04
BIKAUR	24.30	19.63	0.00	2.80	6.54	0.00
PANDEPUR	17.35	12.24	0.00	2.04	0.00	6.12
BASUDEBPUR	55.67	16.49	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NARAYANTOLA	53.85	26.92	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.56
BOGRAM	4.49	11.24	6.74	12.36	3.37	8.99
MAHENDIGAON	19.70	9.09	9.09	3.03	9.09	10.61
BAMANGRAM	9.09	47.73	0.00	2.27	1.14	5.68
RISHIPUR	11.11	27.78	1.11	1.11	0.00	13.33
NEHALIPARA	81.11	1.11	1.11	0.00	0.00	13.33
PARDHA	17.65	35.29	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.47
KUANRPUR	4.40	16.48	0.00	2.20	0.00	0.00
DAMDALIA	24.27	16.50	0.00	0.00	2.91	22.33
BISHNUPUR	46.58	39.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.37

Source: Village survey data

Table 19: Village wise Occupational pattern among the Female (in percentage)

Name of the Village	Female					
	Cultivator	Agricultural Labour	Business	Salaried Employee (Govt.)	Salaried Employee (Pvt.)	Casual Labour (Non-Agriculture)
CHIKNI BARHAS	5.00	1.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.00
BHAGABATI	0.00	17.11	0.00	2.63	0.00	2.63
CHOPRA	0.00	1.19	1.19	2.38	0.00	3.57
BALARAMPUR	5.33	8.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
LAKHIPUR	0.00	1.35	0.00	1.35	0.00	0.00
BARA DAMAODARPUR	14.81	12.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	27.16
MASID KISMAT	2.50	1.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BIRNAKUNDI	3.49	2.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.16
CHURAKUTI	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.37	1.12	0.00
KHRHILA	1.30	5.19	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PANJIPARA	0.00	3.90	2.60	0.00	0.00	1.30
HANSKUNDA	0.00	7.61	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.09
BANGAON	52.00	6.67	0.00	0.00	1.33	1.33
SOSHILAPUR	1.72	27.59	0.00	0.00	1.72	0.00
BAJARGAON	7.27	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BIKAUR	2.27	4.55	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PANDEPUR	0.00	7.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BASUDEBPUR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NARAYANTOLA	18.64	25.42	1.69	0.00	0.00	5.08
BOGRAM	0.00	9.86	0.00	1.41	0.00	1.41
MAHENDIGAON	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.03	0.00
BAMANGRAM	0.00	7.14	0.00	0.00	1.43	0.00
RISHIPUR	1.28	17.95	1.28	0.00	0.00	0.00
NEHALIPARA	76.12	5.97	1.49	0.00	0.00	10.45
PARDHA	8.11	29.73	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
KUANRPUR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
DAMDALIA	8.82	13.24	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.35
BISHNUPUR	5.77	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.92	0.00

Source: Village survey data.

4. Health

The data reveals that people are more dependent on government health centres or hospitals for accessing health facilities. However, both the communities also go to the quacks. In terms of infrastructure out of twenty-five of twenty-eight villages for which survey data are available only four villages have PHC and only one (Lakhipur) boasts of having a government hospital within its Panchayat limits. Generally, sub-PHCs are available within respective *panchayats*. The consequence of this inaccessibility is strongly reflected in the high average incidence of childbirth at home (88.16% of Muslim households and 70.21% of non-Muslim households) with the aid of trained and largely untrained midwives. *Most of the public hospitals are not located in close proximities, and hardly any is located in the neighbourhood of the village or even within the Panchayat. There is hardly any ambulance available for pregnant women to take them to hospitals, people mainly depend upon rented cars. The survey reports that the most dominating reason, around 50 percent, for not visiting a government hospital is the distance one needs to cover.* It is to be noted that, the vaccination programmes have run rather successfully and cover almost 100 percent of families for pulse polio programme and over 80% for other programmes across religious divide. Among those who did not participate in vaccination programmes, did not participate mainly owing to lack of awareness.

**Table 20: Health – Expenditure and Facilities
(Community wise averages for the District)**

		Muslim	Non-Muslim
Annual Average Expenditure for Health per family (Rs)		6730.80	5872.84
Access to health facilities (%) @	Government	49.89	75.84
	Private	32.52	13.09
	Quack	17.75	25.06

Source: Household survey data.

Note: @ % values may exceed 100 as families access more than one facility.

Table 21: Health – Village-wise Averages

Name of the Village	Average expenditure on health (Rs.)	Access to health centers (%)			Vaccination (%)				Problem of Vaccination (%)		
		Government	Private	Quack	Polio	BCG	DPT	Measles	Unaware of the program	Problem of distance	Others
CHIKNI BARHAS	3594.56	3.70	68.97	7.41	85.71	100.0	85.7	100.00	57.69	42.31	0.00
BHAGABATI	4800.00	80.00	20.00	0.00	88.89	100.0	77.78	77.78	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
CHOPRA	12950.00	86.67	33.33	31.03	91.67	91.67	91.67	100.00	0.00	0.00	100
BALARAMPUR	7052.00	100.0	20.00	0.00	100.00	8.33	8.33	8.33	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
LAKHIPUR	10100.00	27.59	76.67	0.00	100.00	81.82	100.00	63.64	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BARA DAMAODARPUR	9835.71	56.67	27.59	0.00	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	0.00
MASID KISMAT	3150.00	100.0	14.29	17.86	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BIRNAKUNDI	1785.71	50.00	0.00	60.71	87.50	93.75	93.75	93.75	93.33	0.00	6.67
CHURAKUTI	4403.33	26.67	3.33	10.00	100.00	92.59	100.00	88.89	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
KHRHILA	1200.00	93.33	0.00	3.33	100.00	90.91	100.00	90.91	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
PANJIPARA	5920.00	46.43	55.17	4.00	100.00	100.0	100.00	92.31	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
HANSKUNDA	4780.00	3.33	3.45	3.45	100.00	90.00	90.00	90.00	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BANGAON	4764.71	6.90	66.67	0.00	100.00	100.0	100.00	50.00	56.25	37.50	6.25
SOSHILAPUR	1360.00	100.0	0.00	66.67	100.00	100.0	91.67	75.00	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BAJARGAON	4656.25	96.67	50.00	16.67	100.00	100.0	100.00	88.89	100.0	0.00	0.00
BIKAUR	4718.75	56.67	32.14	16.67	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.0	0.00	0.00
PANDEPUR	1964.29	100.0	0.00	44.83	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BASUDEBPUR	11700.00	72.41	28.00	7.69	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.0	0.00	0.00
NARAYANTOLA	2092.31	100.0	26.67	73.33	92.86	92.86	92.86	92.86	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BOGRAM	15500.00	75.00	21.43	0.00	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
MAHENDIGAON	2077.27	92.86	0.00	32.14	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	100.0	0.00	0.00
BAMANGRAM	8018.52	13.33	6.67	76.67	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	50.00	0.00	50.0
RISHIPUR	7207.69	46.67	10.00	3.33	84.21	84.21	84.2	68.42	100.0	0.00	0.00
NEHALIPARA	4422.22	100.0	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	75.00	25.00	0.00
PARDHA	9500.00	37.93	0.00	51.72	100.00	100.0	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	100
KUANRPUR	15130.77	86.67	13.79	3.45	100.00	80.00	80.00	40.00	0.00	0.00	100
DAMDALIA	11364.71	20.00	13.33	46.67	100.00	100.0	100.00	83.33	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
BISHNUPUR	14520.00	47.83	13.64	0.00	93.33	93.33	93.33	80.00	0.00	0.00	100

Source: Village survey data.

Table 22: Types of Medical Facilities –Village wise

Name of the Villages	Government Hospitals		PHC		Sub-PHC	
	Within village	Within Panchayat	Within village	Within Panchayat	Within village	Within Panchayat
Bajargaon	N	N	Y	-	Y	-
Bamongram	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Bara Damaodarpur	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Bhagabati	N	Y	N	Y	Y	-
Birnakundi	N	N	N	N	N	N
Baogram	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Chopra	N	Y	NA	NA	N	Y
Damdalia	N	N	N	Y	Y	N
Khrhila	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Lakhipur	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-
Masid Kismat	N	N	N	N	Y	-
Nehalipara	N	N	N	Y	Y	-
Panjiipara	N	N	N	N	Y	-
Rishipur	N	N	N	N	N	N
Balarampur	N	N	NA	NA	Y	-
Bangaon	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Basudebpur	N	N	NA	NA	Y	-
Bikaur	N	N	N	N	N	N
Bishnupur	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Chikni Barhas	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Churakuti	N	N	N	N	Y	-
Hanskunda	N	N	N	Y	Y	-
Kuanrpur	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Mehandigaon	N	N	Y	-	Y	-
Narayantola	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Pandepur	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Pardha	N	N	N	Y	N	Y
Soshilapur	N	N	N	Y	Y	-

Source: Village survey data.**Note:** N = absent, Y = present and NA means *not available*.

**Table 23: Information on Childbirth – Household Response (%)
(Community wise District Averages)**

		Muslim	Non-Muslim
Place of birth	In house	88.16	70.21
	Hospital	9.97	28.09
	Private hospital	1.56	1.70
	Others	0.31	0.00
Support during child birth	Doctor	18.38	26.07
	Nurse	3.74	10.26
	Trained midwife	18.38	24.79
	Non trained midwife	56.70	31.20
	Others/Don't know	2.80	7.69
Transport	Own car	8.73	2.48
	Rented car	26.98	50.41
	No vehicle	61.90	43.80
	Ambulance	2.38	3.31
Reason for not going to Govt. Hospital	Long distance	48.79	59.87
	Unhygienic Govt. hospital	1.93	1.27
	Below grade service	5.80	22.93
	No female doctor	10.14	3.82
	Others	33.33	12.10

Source: Household survey data.

Table 24: Information on Child Birth – Village-wise (%)

Name of villages	Place of birth				Reasons for not visiting Government places				
	At home	Government Hospital	Private Hospital	Others	Problem of distance	Un-cleanliness	Inefficient services by	No female doctors	Others
CHIKNI BARHAS	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	85.19	0.00	3.70	11.11	0.00
BHAGABATI	57.14	38.10	4.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	7.69	30.77	61.54
CHOPRA	57.89	36.84	5.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
BALARAMPUR	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00	75.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	25.00
LAKHIPUR	91.67	4.17	4.17	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.88	94.12
BARA DAMAODARPUR	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	66.67	33.33
MASID KISMAT	66.67	25.93	7.41	0.00	13.64	9.09	0.00	9.09	68.18
BIRNAKUNDI	86.67	10.00	0.00	3.33	33.33	6.67	36.67	23.33	0.00
CHURAKUTI	96.77	3.23	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
KHRHILA	86.67	13.33	0.00	0.00	30.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	70.00
PANJIPARA	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
HANSKUNDA	88.89	7.41	3.70	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BANGAON	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	82.35	0.00	0.00	17.65	0.00
SOSHILAPUR	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	94.12	0.00	5.88	0.00	0.00
BAJARGAON	71.43	28.57	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BIKAUR	57.14	42.86	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PANDEPUR	79.17	20.83	0.00	0.00	5.26	0.00	89.47	5.26	0.00
BASUDEBPUR	80.00	20.00	0.00	0.00	50.00	50.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NARAYANTOLA	40.00	60.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
BOGRAM	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
MAHENDIGAON	66.67	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
BAMANGRAM	92.31	7.69	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
RISHIPUR	88.89	11.11	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
NEHALIPARA	16.67	83.33	0.00	0.00	90.00	10.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
PARDHA	92.86	0.00	7.14	0.00	91.67	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.33
KUANRPUR	41.67	58.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00
DAMDALIA	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Source: Household survey data.

**Table 25: Vaccination of Under Five-Year Children (%)
(Community wise District Averages)**

Vaccination	Muslim			Non Muslim		
Polio (pulse)	97.55			99.17		
DTP	87.16			86.67		
BCG	80.43			84.17		
Measles	75.54			81.25		
Organization	Government	Private		Government	Private	
	99.37	0.63		100.0	0.0	
Reasons for non participation	Unaware	Distance	Others	Unaware	Distance	Others
	72.60	26.03	1.37	70.97	3.23	25.81

Source: Household survey data.

5. Infrastructure

On an average around 88% of the villages surveyed have at least one primary school within the village which is very poor compared to other districts of the state. Only a few villages have secondary schools, in fact the district average of number of secondary schools per village is 0.12. Around 25% of the villages are connected through bus routes with a bus stop within 5 Kms of the village and 43.75% villages have bus stop within 5 to 10 Km., while over 78% villages are connected through train routes with rail stations more than 10 Kms from the village. Around 36% of the villages have commercial banks and 24% have agricultural credit societies within 5 Kms. and 66.67% villages have post offices within respective villages or within 5 Kms.

6. Awareness about Government Programmes

It is easily understood that the success of government sponsored development schemes strongly depend on the level of awareness and hence the participation in using such facilities. *The cross-village data clearly displays that the level of awareness is widely scattered across villages for all the programmes taken together ranging from 10.29% (Narayantola) to 97.78% (Churakuti). The interesting thing about the government programmes is that most of the people*

Table 26: Awareness and Efficacy of the Government Sponsored Development Programmes – District Average for Muslims (%)

Programme	% of people aware	% of beneficiary	Help received from for accessing benefit					% of cases where Commission paid
			Pra dhan	GP Office	NGO	Self	Others	
SGSY	62.22	5.93	73.33	13.33	0.0	13.33	0.0	13.3
NREGS	95.88	23.04	55.79	26.32	9.47	3.16	5.26	15.1
IAY	82.56	2.81	88.89	11.11	0.0	0.0	0.0	44.4
Old age pension	71.62	5.28	81.81	18.18	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Swajal dhara	34.71	0.73	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0
Irri gation	32.26	1.68	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0
ARWSP	34.48	2.24	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
SSA	53.79	22.1	36.84	23.68	0.0	34.21	5.26	0.0
TSC/SSUP	18.13	7.81	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0

Source: Household survey data.

Table 27: Awareness and Efficacy of the Government Sponsored Development Programmes – District Average for non-Muslims (%)

Programme	% of people aware	% of beneficiary	Help received from for accessing benefit					% of cases where Commission paid
			Pra dhan	GP Office	NGO	Self	Others	
SGSY	73.30	21.91	50.0	23.33	16.7	5.0	5.0	5.17
NREGS	92.5	27.14	67.03	29.67	0.0	3.16	1.1	15.1
IAY	88.89	12.78	51.28	33.33	0.0	2.56	12.8	8.57
Old age pension	68.54	4.31	72.73	27.27	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.18
Swajal dhara	19.22	0.0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.0
Irrigation	13.13	2.32	37.5	6.25	6.25	43.75	6.25	0.0
ARWSP	24.59	6.82	80.0	20.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0
Sarba siksha	44.35	36.65	65.52	15.52	0.0	1.72	17.24	5.26
TSC /SSUP	4.70	7.14	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

Source: Household Survey Data.

Note: NA means *not available*.

Table 28: Awareness and Efficacy of Government Schemes – Village-wise

Name of the Villages	Percentage of people aware (all schemes)	Percentage of people benefited (all schemes)	Number of people who have job cards for NREGS	Number of people who have got job under NREGS
Bajargaon	44.07	12.51	1080	660
Bamongram	34.38	23.33	150	15
Bara Damaodarpur	42.53	19.17	496	100
Bhagabati	47.99	7.14	756	100
Birnakundi	55.57	2.31	503	186
Baogram	20.37	46.11	250	150
Chopra	68.2	0.84	858	644
Damdalia	75.77	3.35	599	400
Khrhila	59.86	9.81	128	0
Lakhipur	33.33	100	411	70
Masid Kismat	71.94	10.1	200	200
Nehalipara	42.62	1.59	125	146
Panji para	59.34	3.54	288	49
Rishipur	38.49	0	100	94
Balarampur	58.94	28.29	700	700
Bangaon	49.45	0.84	350	0
Basudebpur	75.64	1.56	65	26
Bikaur	53.92	26.21	597	0
Bishnupur	52.48	0.43	20	10
Chikni Barhas	28.15	17.67	212	250
Churakuti	97.78	1.93	379	145
Hanskunda	58.06	7.25	414	309
Kuanrpur	29.7	5.13	340	200
Mehandigaon	35.58	2.58	200	160
Narayantola	10.29	100	46	31
Pandepur	38.35	10.85	170	40
Pardha	57.26	15.12	46	31
Soshilapur	45.4	0	179	0

Source: Village survey data & Household survey data

Note: N.A means *not available*.

across communities, i.e. over 90% are aware about the NREGS but a very small section of that (around 20% for both the communities) have benefited. Next, for IAY (82.56% among Muslims and 88.89% among non-Muslims) are aware, but the percentage of beneficiaries as we have also witnessed previously under the section on housing facilities that, is pretty low (a mere 2.81% for Muslims and 12.78% for non-Muslims). SGSY is well known among both the groups but percentage of beneficiaries among the Muslim community is very few. It needs careful examination because the programme has its own importance as income generating scheme. There are many other facilities and schemes that the central government have been running for quite some time of which SSA and old age pension are quite known though while a sizable section have benefited though for the latter very few people have benefited. There are other schemes which are not very well known. These include: old age and widow pension, SSA, AWRP, TSC and Swajaldhara. Apparently, the popularity of the NREGS with ready source of income and cash flow seems to receive the highest attention despite longer-term benefits associated with many others already in operation. At this stage, we are not convinced that adding more programmes would be beneficial, unless interest and participation in the existing ones can be maximized with due emphasis on the awareness part of the schemes which could run equally well for all communities. The major source of information in cases of profitable job opportunities have come from the Panchayat Pradhan himself/herself or from the GP office, and there is no report of the fact that NGOs have been of significant help in this connection.

8. Other Issues

We use Tables 29-32 to reflect on a score of other features that are no less important in understanding the reasons behind the acute underdevelopment in these communities, compared to the more well known indicators often invoked for the purpose. These are as follows. About 0.24% of the Muslim and 1.18% non-Muslim respondent families have health insurance and there is around 7% disparity between non-Muslim and Muslim households with regard to purchase of life insurance. Percentage of people buying crop insurance is negligible, and those who deposit money with the bank vary between 1.91% for the Muslims and 3.07% for the non-Muslims, with a higher average deposit value for the former. Among the Muslim households the relatively affluent ones also engage in term deposits and that value also far exceeded by the non-Muslim families. It is worth noting that while insurance, especially life

insurance penetration is quite high corresponding figure for bank penetration is very poor. It needs large scale intervention for building financial institution. And the level of indebtedness is high among both the communities, around 30% of the households surveyed. The average interest rate paid (see Table 30) clearly indicates that the source is still the traditional moneylenders and more than 50% of Muslims and around 30% of non-Muslims have used this source at some point. The meagre percentage of people who borrowed from commercial banks or other government provided sources is rather negligible and well explained by the absence of penetration of banking business in the district. It is also the breakdown of the reasons of indebtedness (vide Table 31) that ties the borrowers with informal moneylenders, since a large part of the loan – around a quarter - is taken for covering medical expenses. However, people also borrow for investing in agricultural implements or other capital expenditure and repair of houses. The use of common property resources is similar across religious communities. Percentage of people belonging to BPL category is higher among Muslims (52.39%) than among non-Muslims (31.88%). More than 75% of the non-Muslims and relatively less – around 38% of the Muslims report the public distribution system to be inefficient, either in terms of inadequacy, inferior quality, less in amount, irregularity and so on. Added to it is the unwillingness of the dealers to sell the commodities (reported by Muslims, 27.48%; non- Muslims, 37.68%; Table 33). On the whole therefore, the assessment re-opens the possibilities of improving upon the lacunas that have been plaguing the district for long enough.

Table 29. Insurance and Financial Assets – Community wise District Averages

		Muslim	Non Muslim
Health Insurance	Percentage of households who have	0.24	1.18
	Average Value (Rs)	2880.0	26300.0
Life Insurance	Percentage of households who have	12.13	19.86
	Average Value (Rs)	14470.42	6939.90
Crop Insurance	Percentage of households who have	N.A.	N.A.
	Average Value(Rs)	N.A.	N.A.
Bank Deposit	Percentage of households who have	1.91	3.07
	Average Value(Rs)	8255.56	42076.92
Fixed Deposit	Percentage of households who have	0.43	1.18
	Average Value (Rs)	1250.0	11200.0

Source: Household survey data.

**Table 30: Indebtedness - Sources and Conditions of Loan
(Community wise District Averages)**

		Muslim	Non Muslim
Percentage of households indebted		27.87	35.46
Average Interest Rate		42.57	29.51
Sources of availing loans (%)	Government	4.58	9.33
	Commercial Bank	3.05	9.33
	Rural Bank	5.34	2.00
	Co-operative Bank	2.29	4.67
	Self Help Group/Non Governmental Organization	0.76	12.67
	Moneylender	58.78	32.00
	Big landowner/Jotedar	1.53	0.00
	Relative	18.32	17.33
	Others	5.34	12.67
Conditions & Terms of Loan (%)	Only Interest	71.54	79.58
	Physical labour	2.44	6.34
	Land mortgage	11.38	9.86
	Ornament mortgage	3.25	1.41

Source: Household survey data.

**Table 31: Indebtedness - Reasons and Nature of Loan
(Community wise District Averages)**

		Muslim	Non Muslim
Reasons of Loan	Capital related expenditure	15.38	8.00
	Purchase of agricultural equipment	9.23	4.67
	Purchase of land/home	6.92	4.00
	Repairing of house	12.31	19.33
	Marriage/other social function	14.62	17.33
	Medical expenditure	23.85	23.33
	Purchase of cattle	3.08	7.33
	Investment	0.77	0.67
	Others	13.85	15.33
Terms – Cash only		95.42	99.33

Source: Household survey data.

Table 32: Common Property Resources – Household Response of Uses and Interference (District Averages)

		Percentage of User		Percentage of Interference	
		Muslim	Non Muslim	Muslim	Non Muslim
Uses and Interference	Forest	30.26	21.88	0.00	5.71
	Pond	49.53	55.77	4.43	8.76
	Field	47.98	55.56	0.80	8.54
	Cattle-pen	26.23	22.32	21.21	23.81
	School ground	55.20	2.01	2.11	0.00
	Other Govt. buildings	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Others	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
		Muslim		Non Muslim	
Categories of people who interfere (%)	Powerful people	0.00		25.00	
	Big landlords	46.15		50.00	
	Each household	30.77		12.50	

Source: Household survey data.

Table 33: Public Distribution System – Community wise District Averages

		Muslim	Non Muslim
APL Card	% of families with APL ration cards	42.79	63.97
BPL Card	% of families with BPL/ Antodaya/ Annapurna card.	52.39	31.88
Sufficiency	% of families with sufficient product	66.06	35.59
Quantity	Rice – Kg. per family per month	8.68	8.07
	Wheat – Kg. per family per month	6.80	8.25
Problem (%)	Inadequate	13.75	42.31
	Inferior quality	5.59	5.64
	Less in amount	6.53	4.36
	Not available in time	9.79	21.03
	Irregular	1.40	1.79
	Others	1.40	0.26
	No problem	61.54	24.62
Purchase	% of families who can purchase all goods	43.18	14.14
Reason for problems of purchase (%)	Monetary constraint	32.44	22.90
	Insufficiency of ration	18.70	19.42
	Unwillingness to sell off by the dealers	27.48	37.68
	Others	21.37	20.00

Source: Household survey data.

Recommendations

We have discussed the conditions of the district in terms of the major indicators; we have provided the current status of the most important eight indicators identified by the Ministry of Minority Affairs, viz. the four religion specific indicators and the four basic amenities indicators. In addition we have also provided the status of the many other indicators that we thought to be of relevance. Some of these are calculated at a more disaggregated level for a particular indicator. For example we have gone into a detailed account of status of education, at different levels as we thought that only literacy is inadequate. We also provided the status of training in vocational trades and the demand for such training. This is important, in our opinion, as we tried to relate the same with job market situation for the general populace.

The above analysis is very broad in nature and requires intervention at a very larger scale and change in the attitude of the process of policy planning. Since the approach of the Multi-sector Development Plan funded by the Ministry of Minority Affairs is supplementary in nature and does not intend to change the very nature of the plan process, it is suggested that the district administration may start working on priority basis with the additional fund in the areas where the deficit can very easily be identified at the district level or at the village or in the pockets of the district. Hence we provide the deficit of the district for the religion specific socio-economic indicators and the basic amenities indicators where the deficit has been calculated as the deviation of the survey averages from national averages provided by the NSSO 2005 and NHFS-3 in Table 34 below. In addition to these indicators we have also discussed about some of the indicators, which in our opinion are extremely important for the development of the district.

It is clear from the table that the district averages perform worst for electrified houses followed by houses with *pucca* walls, W/C toilets, literacy, female literacy and female work participation. In literacy front the situation of the district is poor compared other West Bengal districts. In the other cases district averages are higher than the corresponding national averages. Accordingly the district administration is expected to draw up their development plan funded by the Ministry of Minority Affairs based on the priority ranking of the facilities as listed above. However, it may also be noted that the district averages and the deficits are not uniform across the district, there are large variations across the villages. A comparison may be made consulting the relevant tables for the village level averages. In this way one can find out the priority ranking for the villages separately. Given the representative nature of the sample one can treat those

Table 34: Priority Ranking of Facilities Based on Deficits of District Averages and National Averages

Sl. No.	Indicator	District Average	National Average	Deficit	Priority Rank
I. Socio-economic Indicators					
1	Literacy (%)	48.65	67.3	18.65	4
2	Female Literacy (%)	42.55	57.1	14.55	5
3	Work Participation (%)	42.42	38	-4.42	8
4	Female Work Participation (%)	17.76	21.5	3.74	6
II. Basic Amenities Indicators					
5	Houses with Pucca Walls (%)	15.8	59.4	43.6	2
6	Safe Drinking Water (%)	90.69	87.9	-2.79	7
7	Electricity in Houses (%)	24.29	67.9	43.61	1
8	W/C Toilet (%)	13.32	39.2	25.88	3
III. Health Indicators					
9	Full Vaccination of Children (%)	79.35	43.5	-35.85	-
10	Institutional Delivery (%)	19.34	38.7	19.36	-

Note: District averages are based on sample data on rural areas only, and national averages for Sl. No. (5) to (8) are based on NFHS-3 and the rest are based on NSSO, 2005.

villages or the blocks where they are situated as the pockets of relative backwardness in terms of the above indicators. We draw the attention of the district administration to be cautious when drawing plan for the district.

In addition to the above priority ranking of facilities we also like to point out that there are some findings that the study team of the CSSSC thinks very important from the standpoint of the development of the district. This is specially so where district averages are higher than the corresponding national averages. In such cases it makes better sense to concentrate the efforts of the district administration areas other than the above ten indicators as suggested by the Ministry. These are given below.

- The average number of primary schools per village is 0.88 which is pretty bad. But the district average of the number of primary teachers per school (3.5 per school) is in fact higher than the national average (2.84 per school based on Census 2001), but the national average itself is very poor. It means that on an average all the four classes in a primary school cannot be held. So though the district average is better than the national average, the district administration should pay attention to this.

- So far secondary schools are concerned, the performance of the district is very poor – 0.12 secondary and higher secondary schools per village. This also needs intervention.
- Apparently the district is very poor in terms of health related infrastructure. So looking at only vaccination or institutional delivery is inadequate. A mere 3.7% of villages have government hospitals in its vicinity, 32.07% of villages have primary health centres or sub-centres situated within the village, average distance of primary health centre or sub-centres is 3.99 Km., average distance of government hospital is 9.77 Km., average distance of private hospital or nursing home is 24.32 Km. A large percentage of families – 17.75% Muslims and 25.06% non-Muslims go to quacks for treatment though some of them also go to government hospitals or private practitioners. For taking pregnant women to hospitals for delivery the major means is rented cars, there is hardly any ambulance available for this purpose in the villages. This is an important area where the policy makers should think of providing at least one ambulance per village.
- For the ICDS centres only 21.43 % are housed in government building while 14.29 % have good quality building both of which are very poor compared to West Bengal districts. Average number of visits of ICDS employees is only 5.75 days in a year.

These are by no means can be considered good whether they exceed national average or not, though in most of the cases they are lower than national average.

Appendices

Table A1: General information

	District average	Average for the sample
Area of the village	204.44 Hectares	327.76 Hectares
Household size	5.09 persons	5.19 persons
Area of irrigated land out of total cultivable area (%)	32.97 %	25.99 %
Number of post offices	0.13	0.20
Number of phone connection	1.60	3.40

Source: Village Directory, Census 2001


Table A 2: Approach Roads to the villages

Nature of Approach Roads	Paved Road		Mud Road		Footpath	
	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available	Available	Not Available
Average for the district	35.39 %	64.61 %	98.98 %	1.02 %	54.87 %	45.13 %
Average for sample villages	50.00 %	50.00 %	100.00 %	0.00 %	53.33 %	46.67 %

Source: Village Directory, Census 2001


Fig. A 1 Sources of Water

Average availability of sources of drinking water (%)




Source: Village Directory, Census 2001

Fig. A2: Distance to post-office




Source: Village Directory, Census 2001

Fig. A3: Distance to Public Transport




Source: Village Directory, Census 2001

Fig. A4: Distance of Bank and Other Financial Institutions



Source: Village Directory, Census 2001

Fig. A5: Irrigation



Source: Village Directory, Census 2001

Sampling Methodology

The primary unit for survey is census village. A sample of villages will be selected for each district. If the population of the district is greater than 0.5 million then a total of 30 villages will be chosen for the district and if the population is less than or equal to 0.5 million then 25 villages will be chosen for the district. For the purpose of sampling the district is classified into three strata S_i ($i=1,2,3$). For stratification of villages in the district percentage of minority population will be used as the criteria. But since there is no published data on minority population at the village level, one has to work with percentage of minority population at the level of CD block.

Let N be the no. of CD blocks in a district and p_j ($j=1,\dots,N$) be the percentage of minority population of the j th. block. These N blocks are then arranged in descending order (one can also use ascending order) by p_j . The top 20%, middle 50% and the bottom 30% constitutes S_1 , S_2 and S_3 respectively. Each S_i contains the villages belonging to the respective blocks. Let P_i ($i=1,2,3$) be the proportion of rural population in S_i to district rural population. No. of villages from each strata will be chosen by the proportion of population of that strata in the total. Then denoting the no. of villages to be drawn from S_i by n_i one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} n_i &= (P_i) 25, & \text{if the district population is less than equal to 0.5 million} \\ &= (P_i) 30, & \text{if the district population is greater than 0.5 million,} \end{aligned}$$

subject to a minimum of 6 villages in each stratum.

The villages are chosen by the method of PPS (probability proportional to population) with replacement from each of S_i where aggregate population of villages are the size criteria (as per census 2001).

After the sample villages are chosen by the method described above the next task is to choose the sample of households for each village. If population of the sample village is less than or equal to 1200 all households will be listed. If population of the village is more than 1200, 3 or more hamlet groups will be chosen. For this purpose one may exactly follow the methodology of NSSO for hamlet group formation. A total of two hamlet groups will be chosen from these hamlet groups. Out of these two, one hamlet group will be the one with highest minority population (for the district). Another hamlet group will be chosen randomly from the remaining hamlet groups. The households of chosen hamlet groups will be listed. While listing the

households their minority status will also be collected as auxiliary information.

Given the auxiliary information on minority status of the households they will be classified into five strata – Hindu, Muslim, Christian, Buddhist and Parsi. A total of 30 households will be chosen from each sample village (or the two hamlet groups if hamlet groups have been formed) in proportion to number of households in each stratum subject to a minimum of 2 households in each stratum. The sampling methodology will be simple random sampling without replacement. If there is no listing in any stratum then the corresponding group will be ignored for that village.

The rule followed by NSSO for forming hamlet-groups is given below.

Approximate present population of the village	no. of hamlet-groups to be formed
1200 to 1799	3
1800 to 2399	4
2400 to 2999	5
3000 to 3599	6
.....and so on	